

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of JEREMY ROBINSON, a/k/a  
JERMEY ROBINSON, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LISA JOHNSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

WILLIE ROBINSON, JR.,

Respondent.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIE ROBINSON, JR.,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

LISA JOHNSON,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

October 2, 1998

No. 203596

Washtenaw Juvenile Court

LC No. 93-021723 NA

No. 205457

Washtenaw Juvenile Court

LC No. 93-021723 NA

---

Before: Hood, P.J., and Griffin and O'Connell, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent Lisa Johnson appeals as of right from a juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g), and respondent Willie Robinson, Jr., appeals by delayed leave granted from the same order terminating his parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (g). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Because only statutory ground for termination need be established to terminate parental rights, and the because brief on appeal of respondent Willie Robinson, Jr. presents no argument concerning whether the juvenile court erred in finding that the grounds for termination under § 19b(3)(a)(ii) and (d) were established by clear and convincing evidence, respondent Robinson is entitled to no appellate relief. MCR 7.212(C)(7); *Goolsby v Detroit*, 419 Mich 651, 655 n 1; 358 NW2d 856 (a party may not merely assert an error and then leave it to the reviewing court to discover and rationalize the basis of a claim). We affirm the judgment of the juvenile court as concerns respondent Robinson on the these unchallenged statutory grounds.

Further, we hold that the juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that three statutory grounds concerning respondent Robinson and one statutory ground concerning respondent Johnson were established by clear and convincing evidence.<sup>1</sup> MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Although respondents have not specifically briefed the issue of the child's best interests, we note that both respondents failed to show that termination of their parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1977). Thus, the juvenile court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to the child. *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Harold Hood  
/s/ Richard Allen Griffin  
/s/ Peter D. O'Connell

<sup>1</sup> We are unconcerned with the juvenile court's minor ministerial error of citing subsection (d) of MCL 712A.19b(3); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3), where all parties agree that the court's decision was in fact based on subsection (g).